DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 846 SO 030 012

AUTHOR Harwood, Angela M.
TITLE The Effects of Close Up Participation on High School Students' Political Attitudes.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Experimental Curriculum; Higher Education; High Schools; *Political Attitudes; Questionnaires; *Social Science Research; *Student Development
IDENTIFIERS *Close Up Foundation

ABSTRACT

The study examines the effect of an experiential learning program on high school students' attitudes toward political institutions and on their political behavior. Chosen randomly from Georgia high schools, students were selected from the population attending Close Up Foundation activities during 1989. The hypotheses were that students who participate in an experiential citizenship education program would: (1) show increased political interest; (2) show increased feelings of efficacy; (3) show an increase in political confidence; (4) show an increase in political trust; and (5) become more politically active. The experience was provided by the Close Up Foundation, a private, non-profit organization specializing in experiential citizenship education. Experimental subjects (n=58) ranging in age from 15-19 years spent 1 week in Washington, D.C. in a program designed to provide an understanding of government and their roles as citizens. Comparison subjects (n=113) were 15- to 19-year-olds attending Close Up in a Georgia school. A pretest, posttest, experiential-comparison group design was used. The data showed that the Close Up experience in D.C. increased positive feelings toward government and stimulated political participation. A 69-item reference list, political attitude scale, the six page student questionnaire used in the study, and four tables are appended. (NL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED320846

# The Effects of Close Up Participation on High School Students' Political Attitudes

Angela M. Harwood
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 16-20, Boston, MA.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ANGELA M HARWOOD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 012

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The success of our democratic system rests on the active participation of a civically educated citizenry; for that reason, it is very important to understand how political knowledge and attitudes are acquired. Determining the roots of political attitudes and actions has spurred the study of political socialization through years of educational debate. The roles played by family, peer groups, classroom social studies programs, and extracurricular activities are among the socialization agents which have been examined in efforts to pinpoint the formation of political orientations. Research assessing the effects of these learning environments has provided valuable clues to help solve the puzzle of how political ideals are formed and how political action is stimulated, but they have also raised many interesting questions for further exploration.

The purpose of this research was to examine the effect of an experiential learning program on high school students' attitudes toward political institutions and on their political behavior. Did students who participated in the politically or socially-related experiential learning program change their feelings of political interest, confidence, efficacy or trust? How did the experience affect their predisposition to become involved in politics in the future?

Today's youth are becoming increasingly politically disenfranchised. The percentage of 18- to 25-year-olds who vote indicates that citizens in this age group are the least likely to participate in the political system. In the 1986 election, only 16.6 percent of the eligible voters in this age group exercised their right to vote. Because voting is generally regarded as the lowest common denominator of democratic political participation, this trend is particularly alarming. Historically, as groups have gained the right to vote, their participation has increased. In a departure from this trend, in the years since youth have been enfranchised, their participation has remained consistently low. Without adequate encouragement to develop positive political attitudes and behaviors, our democratic citizenry runs the risk of losing the rights for which it has struggled. Since the earliest attempts at integrating social studies into the formal public school curriculum, there have been calls for social studies educators to instill the values of democratic participation in their students. Methods of increasing interest in the political process, and helping young people to develop the skills they will need to effectively participate continue to be explored by social educators. One promising method for instilling the values of active participation is experiential learning.

## Definition of Experiential Learning

Experiential learning may be simply defined as learning by doing. Experiential methods of education have long been employed in the United States. The interaction of theoretical and practical knowledge was an important part of education in American universities in the 1870s (Houle, 1976). Students were assigned practical work projects which corresponded to their book assignments: botanists worked in gardens; stockbreeders cared for stock; and mechanics worked in workshops. The tradition grew to include the use of laboratory practice and observation for medical students, moot courts for law students, and practice teaching for educators.

Recent evaluations of experiential learning theories have refined the ideas of effective experiential education. Coleman (1976) described the experiential learning process in four steps: 1) the learner engages in an action, observing and gaining information about a sequence of causes and effects; 2) the learner examines the effects of the action to understand it in the particular circumstance in which it happened; 3) the learner begins to recognize how this specific knowledge forms a general principle; and, finally, 4) the learner applies the generalized knowledge to new and different problems. Coleman also described the general properties of the experiential process, pointing out that intrinsic motivation for learning is a part of the process. Students must immediately discern the keys to *guiding* their interaction if they are to gain their ends through *directing* it. Coleman further observed that knowledge gained through experience should be more readily remembered, because it will be associated with

concrete actions and events, and not merely with abstract symbols or mere discussions of principles.

Theories of experiential learning have formed the basis of much recent discussion of integrating social action into the social studies curriculum. With the advent of the "new social studies" curriculum projects emphasizing the use of discussions, simulations, and community-based involvement, much attention was focused on experiential learning in citizenship education. Research indicates interesting findings contrasting experiential learning with classroom learning experiences. The regular classroom curriculum has been shown to have little effect on students' political attitudes or involvement (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Ehman, 1980; Patrick, 1972). On the other hand, students who have participated in community involvement programs, extracurricular activities, and school governance bodies are more likely to display increased political behavior and more positive political attitudes (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Conrad, 1979; Eyler, 1982; Hedin & Conrad, 1980; Holland & Andre, 1987; Jones, 1974; Otto & Featherman, 1975; Stentz, 1974; Ziblatt, 1970). Many practitioners are recognizing the need to use active involvement in political education in order to make the complicated facts and theories of social studies more meaningful for students.

For example, D'Amico (1981) insisted it is reasonable to assume that if students can *use* skills, rather than *learn about* using them, and combine the action with reflection, they will be more motivated to participate actively in society. Others have emphasized: 1) the young are citizens now, not just preparing for citizenship; 2) students, as citizens, can make meaningful contributions to the welfare of their communities; 3) adolescents benefit from the opportunity to participate as citizens; and 4) schools can and should facilitate youth participation in community affairs (Conrad & Hedin, as cited in Singleton, 1981). Acceptance of these four assumptions, argued Singleton, indicates that participatory citizenship should be the primary focus of social studies education. Further, active learning must be incorporated to help students reach social competencies including communication, group cooperation, and decision making (Singleton, 1981).

Drawing on Deweyian principles of learning, Chiarelott (1979) maintained that educators must use the personal experiences of their students to enable them to find meaning in the difficult concepts of social studies disciplines. He cited Dewey's four principles of education, and suggested how they may be met using knowledge students have gained through experience. *Contiguity and interaction*, the use of prior experience to build new knowledge, and applying new knowledge in different situations, may be accomplished by students examining their decision-making experiences. *Action* may be obtained through student involvement in a simulation or internship experience which is carefully guided and *reflection* occurs when the experience is debriefed through group reconstruction and examination of events. Dewey's final principle *the emergence of subject matter*, will then naturally follow participation in an activity and careful reflection, with political concepts emerging as a "crystallization of experience, rather than the imposition of static knowledge" (Chiarelott, 1979).

## Development of a Rationale for Experiential Learning in Social Studies

Social studies curriculum and teaching methodology has long been the subject of debates for social educators. Since the recognition of the importance of history in the formal school curriculum by the National Education Association "Committee of the Ten" in 1892, educators have searched for the most effective means of teaching citizenship. The place of active learning within the curriculum has received attention during several periods within the history of social studies education.

In the 1938 Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (West, 1938) Paul Hanna emphasized the need for experiential curricular components as follows:

> Our youth will learn appropriate social behavior and develop social responsibility to the degree that we provide them with participation in those human activities in the community which by their very conditions demand creative and cooperative social action for solution (p. 138).

In the 1940s, several citizenship education projects designed to provide active learning were developed (Hertzburg, 1982). In the wake of race riots in 1943 in the Detroit area, Detroit University instituted an active learning program to help ease the intercultural tensions the nation was feeling following its involvement in World War II. Educators at Columbia University also designed experiential citizenship education programs to help provide students an avenue for participation in democratic activities, and to help them better understand the actual workings of our democratic government.

Recently, social educators are once again evaluating the place of active learning in social studies education. The 1979 Revision of Curriculum Guidelines published by the National Council for the Social Studies (Roselle, 1979) called for four curricular components: knowledge; abilities; valuing; and social participation. The participation component was included because involvement in communities was deemed "essential" to student growth. The rationale for its inclusion reads: "A commitment to democratic participation suggests that the school abandon futile efforts to insulate pupils from social reality, and, instead, find ways to involve them as citizens" (p. 266).

Most recently, calls have been made to add a Carnegie Unit of community service to the formal curriculum of our schools (Boyer, 1983); to provide community involvement to increase students' sense of efficacy (Gans, 1988); and to involve students in school and community governance to help them develop democratic attitudes and norms (Langton, 1988). This recent attention accentuates the need for research which carefully builds on past findings to define the effects of experiential programs on students' political attitudes and behaviors.

## Review of Research

The call to create citizens who possess the necessary skills for active participation through experiential learning has encouraged the formulation of myriad social studies projects and curricular ideas. Inquiry into the effects of these programs on knowledge acquisition and political attitudes, however, has yielded relatively few conclusions supported by empirical research. Much of the evidence is anecdotal in nature, with practitioners describing curriculum units or participatory experiences and making observations of apparent changes in student behavior or attitudes. An examination of the existing research in experiential learning, extracurricular activities, and political socialization provides some important insights into the potential effects of participatory programs on political knowledge, attitudes, and involvement orientations.

### Experiential Education

Participation in many types of experiential citizenship education programs has been evaluated. Findings from the research suggest that many of these experiences provide valuable changes in political attitudes and interest, and that the impact may vary depending upon the type of experience and the race, gender, and age of the students.

In 1971-1972, the Citizen Education Clearing House (CECH) of St. Louis, Missouri, implemented and evaluated a program based on student civic participation (Jones, 1974). Over 2,000 students in the 8$^{th}$ through 12$^{th}$ grades were involved in defining problems, policies, and strategies as well as taking action to bring about change in social issue areas varying from establishing birth control information centers to seeking support for constitutional amendments. Jones reported the program's effect on political efficacy, political awareness, perceptions of public officials, desire to be an official, and participatory behavior. In comparisons with paired

control classes, CECH classes were somewhat more effective in increasing feelings of efficacy and improving political involvement. Students participating in the CECH classes showed an increase in their awareness of participation opportunities and feelings of efficacy for doing something about an identified community problem. Aggregate comparisons also indicated that CECH classes rated higher on participatory behavior measures.

In another study conducted in 1972, Jones (1975a) measured the impact of political involvement on 214 8th through 12th grade students, comparing the attitudes of groups which were classified as politically involved or non-involved. The findings indicated that female students who were involved displayed less political attention and interest than non-involved females, and that involvement was more positive for older students than younger students. It was also reported that involved students were more interested in community activities, and that they had an increased interest in government, particularly in racially integrated community settings.

In a third report of research conducted in St. Louis, Jones (1975b) measured the political efficacy and trust of students who were involved in a community action program. Students worked on issues related to elections and campaigning, health and welfare, ecology, and public law and safety. They were involved in producing in-class activities, organizing and joining special interest groups, contacting public officials, volunteering time, and conducting surveys. Jones found that various student populations, depending on their age and race, had different responses to their experiences. While some students gained political trust and feelings of efficacy from their experiences, the researcher found that that was the exception, rather than the rule, and she recommended that a cautious approach to the adoption of such programs, carefully tailoring them to student characteristics, was warranted.

In a later study, Jones (1980) reported the relationships of political tolerance and political knowledge with participatory behavior. The study was based on a secondary analysis of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Data (a 1978 report by the Education Commission of the States) which used a national stratified probability sample of students nine, 13, and 17 years old. Jones found that tolerant attitudes are more highly correlated with participation than information, which may suggest that formal programs that emphasize participation skills and active orientations stimulate tolerance. Participation was also found to be the best explanation for levels of information among 13-year-olds.

In an unpublished study Stentz (1974) reported on the effects of participating in the Close Up Washington Week program. The political confidence, interest, and sophistication of over 1,000 students who attended the program were measured by a questionnaire. Results indicated that political confidence and sophistication increased, and many students also became more interested in politics following the Close Up experience. A delayed posttest indicated that the confidence and sophistication improvements persisted for at least five months. No comparison group was used in the study.

The effect of 30 experiential programs involving over 4,000 students was evaluated by Hedin and Conrad (1980). Students ranged from ages 12 to 19, were from urban and rural areas, and participated in programs ranging from political and social action through internships in government and business, to volunteer service and outdoor adventure. Conrad and Hedin were primarily interested in determining the effect of experiential learning on students' social, psychological, and intellectual development, as well as assessing how various program formats affected student growth. Their findings indicated that the psychological gains (as measured by the Rostenburg Self Esteem and Janis-Fielding Feelings of Inadequacy scales) included an increase in general self esteem, feelings of usefulness, and ability to do things well. Social gains, measured by their Personal and Social Responsibility Scale, included more positive attitudes toward adults, more positive feelings towards persons with whom they worked (elderly, government officials, etc.), and gains in feelings of social competence, duty, and efficacy.

Conrad (1979) has further reviewed findings related to political attitudes from a variety of sources. He cited three unpublished dissertations which addressed how experiential programs affect political attitudes. He reported a study by Wilson (1974) which found that students who were involved in political or social action within the school or community increased their

feelings of political efficacy and became more open-minded (as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale) as a result of their experiences. Conrad also reports Stockhaus' (1976) findings that students involved in a 20 hour per semester volunteer community experience did not significantly increase their feelings of political efficacy, although they did show increased feelings of social responsibility, community responsibility, and altruism when compared with non-participants. A third study reviewed evaluated the effects of a community involvement program designed to instill in students a commitment to solve social problems (Corbett, cited in Conrad, 1979). Corbett found that a combination of 10 hours per week of volunteer service with a two hour a week classroom component, caused a slight decrease in students' sense of social responsibility and political efficacy among first-time volunteers. The students did, however, score significant increases on measures of tolerance, empathy, and sense of well-being.

Newmann (1979) has also reported the results of a community studies program. He evaluated the effects of an experimental curriculum project which included student involvement in research, service, and advocacy in the community in combination with classroom studies in communications and political-legal processes. A pretest-posttest evaluation of the program, which was completed by nine students, indicated the following effects: the number of program students expressing interest in public affairs increased; the program had no impact on levels of political tolerance; program students' political trust decreased slightly; political efficacy increased slightly; and anticipated future political participation also increased.

Taken as a whole, this body of literature presents the indication of several important possible outcomes for experiential education in the field of citizenship education. The studies reviewed present some conflicting findings, which increases the difficulty of evaluating the potency of experiential learning in the social studies. The consistency in the reports of positive impacts on political attitudes, participation orientation, and the understanding of political systems, however, warrant further exploration.

## Extracurricular Activities

A second body of literature which provides guidance for research on experience-based programs links the participation in intra-school experiences with political attitudes and behavior. Several researchers evaluated the impact of participation in extracurricular activities, a form of experiential learning, on how students view politics, and on the extent of students later involvement in political activities.

Holland and Andre (1987) reviewed a series of studies on the effects of student participation in extracurricular activities. They noted research on activities ranging from involvement in team sports to work in social and political programs. They reported that participation is associated with greater peer value and higher self esteem, improved race relations, and reduced numbers of delinquent acts. Holland and Andre also reviewed longitudinal work which indicates that involvement in activities in high school related positively to political involvement in a population studied two years after high school. They also reported that social participation of a group of young adults five years after high school was best predicted by their involvement in extracurricular activities during their high school years.

In research specifically relating political attitudes to extracurricular involvement, Ziblatt (1970) reported that students who participate in activities feel more integrated into the high school status system, which, in turn, increases their social trust. Increases in social trust also corresponded with more positive political attitudes. Ziblatt concluded that extracurricular participation will yield improved political attitudes.

Eyler (1982) also explored the relationship between extracurricular activities and political attitudes. Using data collected on 2,546 students in four states, Eyler identified political skills which can be sharpened by students participating in groups, including planning and directing activities, articulating points of view, evaluating alternatives, reducing tensions, and involving others. Results indicated that the best predictor of group participation in school activities was school political attitudes. Eyler found that students generalized socio-political attitudes toward society to the school, and that those students with positive attitudes were more

likely to become involved in school activities than were students with negative attitudes. School political interest and confidence were the best predictors of student involvement.

Additional longitudinal work has been conducted to further explore the link between participation in activities in high school with political participation in adult life. Otto and Featherman (1975) reported the results of a 15 year longitudinal inquiry into the effects of extracurricular participation. They found that high school participation was moderately correlated with adult participation for the 354 male respondents surveyed.

Other findings have strengthened those of Otto and Featherman. Hanks (1981) used data from the Educational Testing Service National Longitudinal Study of the High School Senior Class of 1972 to ascertain how extracurricular activities related to political activities in young adulthood. Baseline data from 1972 were compared with data collected from a two year follow-up study. Hanks found that adolescent participation in honorary clubs, subject matter clubs, student government and vocational education was positively and significantly related to all measures of political participation in young adulthood. Active high school students were more frequent participators in discussions of political issues, campaign work, and voting as young adults. Hanks interpreted his findings from a mobilization perspective: students who are members of associated groups were provided with the attitudes, incentives, information and other personal skills and resources necessary for their later political actions. Beck and Jennings (1982), who used panel data from 1965-1973 to create a model of influencers of political participation, also found that high school activities exerted a strong direct effect on later participation in politics. They concluded that the pre-adult socialization which occurs in student participation in high school activities, does, indeed, propel them into participation in later life.

The existing research indicates many positive outcomes of extracurricular activity involvement. Improved political attitudes, participation in social or political activities after high school, and improved social attitudes as manifested by decreased delinquency and reduced tensions are all important facets of better citizenship skills. The work of Eyler (1982) confirmed positive relationships, but raises important questions of their causal order. It is difficult to discern whether participation in extracurricular activities leads to improved political attitudes, or if the reverse is true, that positive political attitudes predispose students to become involved in extracurricular activities.

## Political Socialization

Political socialization literature is extensive, and research on the effects of various agents may shed light on aspects of experiential education for citizenship. Findings from the research indicate that schools, in general, have a relatively small influence on students' political development. Extensive inquiries into the impact of familial atmosphere have also been conducted.

The effects of schools. Ehman's (1980) review of research on the role of schools in the socialization process is helpful in assessing how traditional schooling affects politicization. In most research, Ehman says, schooling appears to be more closely linked with political knowledge acquisition than with the shaping of political attitudes and participatory behaviors. Teachers' influence may be affected by their credibility, and the most consistent findings indicate that they have a greater impact on children of lower socio-economic status parents.

Consistent with most of the findings reported in Ehman's review, Patrick (1972) found that a course on American Political Behavior, which focused on the political process in terms of political culture, socialization, and role adoption, had little or no impact on political attitudes. Langton and Jennings (1968) found that the number of social studies courses taken by students was not correlated to their later political participation, and Fowlkes (1974) likewise found schools to be only a secondary influence in encouraging student involvement.

Individual classrooms have also been evaluated for their influence. The greatest impact of teachers appears to lie in their control of the classroom climate. In a Detroit high school, Ehman (1969) found that controversial issues discussion, in an open atmosphere conducive to inquiry

and tolerance of ideas, produced an increased awareness of civic duty, and mixed results on political cynicism, efficacy, and participation. Ehman (1970) also reported that normative discussions (discussions in which opinions are expressed and evaluated) dealing with questions of "right and wrong" or "good and bad" were related to decreases in political cynicism.

Other school agents which have been analyzed include ability track placement, ideology and political participation, and the general school climate. Travers (1983) found that students who participated in alternative school programs in 1979, and in higher level ability track placement programs in 1970, generally held more critical views of the government, and were more likely to actively participate in school political activities. Both of these settings separate students from their peers on the basis of factors such as career aspirations, ability and achievement levels, or their incongruent views on social issues.

The school governance climate is also recognized as an important correlate of student political attitudes (Ehman, 1980). Positive political attitudes and the political behavior of students have been linked to more participation and less authoritarian climates. Students who actively participate in democratically organized schools have shown improved political efficacy, trust, and social integration (Wittes, 1972, cited in Ehman, 1980).

The general school atmosphere has also been evaluated by Metzger and Barr (1978). They examined the political systems within schools to determine what effect, if any, school structures had on student attitudes or involvement. They compared students from a large comprehensive high school to students enrolled in alternative programs which included community-based experiences as part of a school-within-a-school system in the same building. They found that students in the alternative program perceived themselves to be more influential and involved in decision making than their counterparts in the comprehensive school, and that they also had high levels of trust and interest in the wider political system, suggesting an important link between participation and positive attitudes.

Renshon (1975) also found that the degree to which students had a voice in the decision-making structure of the school affected their feelings of trust and efficacy. Students who perceived that they had influence in their schools had correspondingly high levels of faith in government and in heir ability to influence governmental decisions.

In short, the importance of schooling in the formulation of adolescents' political attitudes and behaviors is not generally highly acknowledged. The formal curricular aspects of schooling have not proven to be important factors in shaping the broad underlying values which have been closely linked with democratic participation. There is, however, other evidence which suggests that the norms of governance in classroom and overall school climates may have some impact in shaping participatory behaviors.

Other socialization agents. Many other possible agents of political socialization have been studied by political scientists, including the influences of parents, peers, and the media. Much of the early work in determining the role of families in the socialization process focused primarily on how partisan beliefs were transmitted or how attitudes toward authority were developed. Hyman (1959) reported the results of many studies which showed moderate correlations between parents' and childrens' political orientations. Many others have further explored ideological intergenerational development. Less exploration into the underlying values of concern for this research has been made.

Hess and Torney (1967) postulated that childrens' experience in the family structure would expose them to a hierarchical social system and impart values and attitudes which would anticipate formal political socialization. They viewed the primary role of the family, however, as one which supported the socialization which occurred in other institutions (e.g. school or church).

Some evidence as to how broad parental attitudes affect their offspring has been found. Parental attitudes and participation have been found to have indirect effects on the political activity of young adults (Beck & Jennings, 1982). Beck and Jennings found that parental knowledge, efficacy, and interest were directly related to their children's similar civic orientations, and served as moderating variables in a path analysis of youth political activity.

Milbrath (1965) found that closely knit families were more likely to have greater influences on children's political development than were those which were less close. He also found that adults who had been exposed to political discussions and various political media in their homes as children reported a higher level of exposure to political stimuli in later years.

Another important, although indirect influence of the family atmosphere may be derived from the consistently observed correlations between socioeconomic status and political attitudes and behaviors. Adults from higher socioeconomic standing are more likely to trust government, have higher feelings of efficacy, show more interest in politics, and participate more often in the political process (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Hess & Torney, 1967; Milbrath, 1965; Renshon, 1975). It is therefore likely that students raised in families with higher socioeconomic status will be exposed to more positive attitudes and more frequent examples of political involvement.

## Limitations of Studies

Evidence from research in experiential learning, extracurricular activity involvement, and political socialization suggests that there are many agents which affect students' development of political ideals. There are indications that involvement in an activity which is in or simulates a political environment correlates with improved political attitudes and increased interest and inclination toward participation. Most of this research, however, has shown moderate or weak correlations between political attitudes, knowledge, and participatory orientations and involvement in out-of-classroom experiences. The reporting of many of these studies makes a thorough evaluation of their method impossible, but many appear to have problematic designs. When the reliability of instruments was reported it was often discouragingly low. Analysis of questionnaire items which were reported often indicated that items were confusingly worded, and there were few reports of the field testing of questionnaires which were used. In addition, many studies have adopted a very narrow view of political behavior, limiting it to participation in the formal political system, and have not included variables which measure political experiences students may have had in school. Many studies also have neglected to measure students' anticipated future involvement.

The failure to use effective controls in many of the studies leaves open questions of causality of the effects which were measured. Not all studies used comparison groups in the experimental design against which to compare changes observed in treatment groups. Another confound is introduced in studies which evaluated the impact of a range of activities, for instance non-discriminantly including participation in sports with participation in student government, blurring the lines of the potentially different impacts these programs might have. Little effort to control for the length of participation, its intensity, and the actual activities in which students took part also makes comparing dissimilar experiences difficult. Given that political socialization literature indicates that the classroom curriculum is a weak socializing agent, and research on extracurricular activities and experiential learning indicates the potential impact of these programs in the socialization process, further careful research is needed to help isolate what types of experiences substantively contribute to students' political outlooks.

## Hypotheses

Based on the findings of research in experiential education, political socialization, and extracurricular activities, and addressing the questions of this study, hypotheses were posed. Students who participate in an experiential citizenship education program which enables them to actively discuss governmental issues with public officials and experts, as well as with their peers would: 1) show increased political interest; 2) show increased feelings of efficacy; 3) show an increase in their political confidence; 4) show an increase in political trust; and 5) become more politically active.

**Definitions**

*Experiential learning* is learning which is derived through experience, and politically related experiential learning, for the purposes of this study, was operationally defined as participation in the Close Up Foundation Core Program. *Political attitudes* were defined to mean the feelings students have toward political institutions, public officials, and political processes, and were measured by a questionnaire containing six scales: 1. *Political Confidence* is the feeling that one can personally influence decision making. 2. *Political Interest* is a general interest in political matters. 3. *Political Trust* is defined as the feeling that government is trustworthy and efficient. 4. *Political Efficacy* is the belief that citizens can influence decisions made by the government, and that the political system is responsive to citizens. 5. *Women's Participation* is a scale designed to measure students' feelings toward various roles women might assume in politics. 6. *Classroom Climate* measures the atmosphere and activities of school social studies classes. *Political behavior* is defined as actual involvement in formal political activity, or student participation in quasi-political school activities, and was measured by the Political Participation Index.

This study evaluated the impact of the experiential citizenship program for high school students which is sponsored by the Close Up Foundation. The Close Up Foundation is a Washington D.C.-based private, non-profit organization which specializes in experiential citizenship education. Participants spend one week in Washington D.C. and are involved in a rigorous program designed to give them a better understanding of government and their roles as citizens. Participants in the program include students of all ability levels, socio-economic levels, and ethnic backgrounds; they come from all states in the union and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In 1989, over 28,000 high school students and teachers attended the program and met with government officials, professional lobbyists, representatives of foreign governments, and experts in all aspects of governmental relations for lectures and question sessions. Students were also involved in on-site learning experiences at a range of Washington landmarks, including time spent on Capitol Hill and at major national monuments. In addition, workshops and activities provided students with a chance to discuss all facets of the program and explore other governmental processes and issues through simulations and role plays. This particular program was chosen for evaluation because of the educational techniques employed by the Foundation and the access it provided to a widely varying population of participants from all regions and backgrounds.

## Methodology

A pretest, posttest, experimental-comparison group design was used. The Political Attitudes Questionnaire was administered twice to both experimental and comparison groups participating in the study, and provided a preliminary measure and a post-treatment measure of students' political attitudes and behaviors for comparisons across groups. The use of the comparison group of students was intended to control for possible effects of classroom teachers, the schooling environment, and outside political events to which both groups would be exposed.

All pretest questionnaires were administered by the Close Up Teacher Coordinator in each school during the week of January 16-23, 1989, prior to school participation in the experimental treatment. Both experimental and comparison students received the pretest questionnaires during this week. The administration of the posttest questionnaire was also conducted by Teacher Coordinators, and took place from four to six weeks following participation in the Close Up program, again with experimental and comparison students receiving questionnaires during the same week. Data from these two separate measures were analyzed to test the hypotheses of this study.

## Sample

A stratified random sample of Georgia high schools from the population of schools attending Close Up during 1989 was chosen for participation in the study. The sample was controlled for proportional representation of the date of program attendance, and the number of urban, suburban, and rural schools which participated from the state. The sample was drawn based on the Close Up Foundation's pre-enrollment attendance projections. Ten of the 66 Georgia schools attending the program during the weeks of January 22, February 5 and 26, and April 30 participated in the study. The 10 participating schools represented 10 different counties: 10% of the sample came from highly populated urban areas; 60% came from moderately populated suburban areas; and 30% came from sparsely populated rural areas[1]. Due to subject attrition and cancellation of school participation, which were greatest in urban areas, this sample may slightly under-represent the number of students from urban areas.

A total of 171 completed pretest-posttest matches were collected from the sampled population. The sample included 58 experimental subjects from the selected schools who traveled to Washington, D.C. to attend the Close Up program. They ranged in ages from 15 to 19 years (mean age=16.6 years), and consisted of 13 males and 45 females. Comparison subjects were students from the one social studies class attended by the majority of students attending Close Up from that school. The 113 comparison subjects ranged in ages from 15 to 19 years (mean age=16.7 years) and consisted of 53 males and 60 females.

## Instrument

The Political Attitudes Questionnaire was designed to measure students' political attitudes, explore their political participation, and to garner demographic information for analyses. The questionnaire was divided into three sections and contained a total of 113 items.

The Political Attitudes Questionnaire was pilot tested on a sample of 30 private high school students in the Atlanta area. The pilot study was conducted to determine the length of time required for completion of the questionnaire; to identify confusing or unclear questions and instructions; and to determine initial reliability coefficients for the attitude scales contained in the instrument. Based on the results of the field test, it was determined that students would require from 25 to 35 minutes to complete the questionnaire. In addition, several questions were added to political attitude measures, and some questions were slightly re-worded. The results of this initial reliability check and the subsequent changes in the scale items are found in Appendix A.

Political attitude measurements. The initial conceptualization of describing political attitudes was put forth by Campbell, Gurin, and Miller in 1952. They reasoned that understanding citizens' political involvement would require a consideration of variables which went beyond the measures of dogmatism or ideology popular in the literature at that time, and tapped broader and more enduring political values and attitudes. They further maintained that exploring these underlying attitudes would contribute to a clearer definition of what motivates citizens to become involved. The questionnaire designed for this study explored student attitudes on a number of underlying attitudinal constructs.

The Political Attitudes Questionnaire used in this study contained 67 statements designed to measure students' attitudes about themselves as political participants, about government, and about their classrooms. Students responded on a six-point Likert Scale, signaling their agreement or disagreement with each item. In addition to scales used traditionally in political socialization research -- political trust, political efficacy, political interest, and political confidence -- two additional scales designed to measure students' attitudes toward women's participation in politics and toward their social studies classroom climate were included in the questionnaire.

The 12-item Political Confidence Scale and 10-item Political Interest Scale were adapted from measures developed by Ehman and Gillespie (1975) and used in several later studies (Hahn & Avery, 1985; Hahn, Tocci, & Angell, 1988; Harper, 1987). In these studies, the Cronbach

alphas for political confidence were .80 (Hahn & Avery, 1985) and .77 (Harper, 1987). Alphas for political interest were .86 (Hahn et al., 1988) and .87 (Harper, 1987). Several original items were added to each of these scales.

Political Efficacy Scale items were taken from scales used by Hahn, Tocci, and Angell (1988), which incorporated some items used frequently in earlier socialization studies (Campbell, Converse, Miller & Stokes,1960; Easton & Dennis, 1969; Ehman, 1972; Hess & Torney, 1967; and Jennings & Niemi, 1974). The alpha of the Hahn et al. (1988) scale was reported as .62. For this study, the two items from that scale which showed the lowest inter-item correlation were dropped, and other new items were added.

The items used in this scale reflect a substantial reconceptualization of "efficacy" which departs from the meaning traditionally attached to this term. As first used by Campbell, et al. (1952), efficacy was defined as the "feeling that ***individual*** political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, i.e. that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties" (p. 187, emphasis added). Consequently, Campbell's efficacy scale, and others which have built upon it, have used a mixture of personal referents ("me", "my family and me", or "people like me") and general referents ("citizens" or "people") in question wordings. In an attempt to refine this scale, and to separate the constructs of "efficacy " and "confidence", personal referents were used only in the political confidence questions, and more general referents were used in questions of political efficacy. This is consistent with changes made by Ehman (1977) and Hahn et al. (1988), and signals a departure from Campbell's original conceptualization of the scale: efficacy is redefined to be a feeling that citizens in ***general*** have an influence in politics. The original spirit of the efficacy scale, however, is retained.

Political Trust items were also adapted from Hahn et al. (1988). The Cronbach alpha for the earlier scale was .78. Two items used by Agger, Goldstein, and Pearl (1961), and one other item used by Ehman (1969) were added for this study.

The Women's Participation Scale was adapted from the scale used by Hahn et al. (1988, alpha=.83). This earlier scale used one item from the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement study (Torney, Oppenhiem & Farnen, 1975), and added several other items. For this study, one of the items used by Hahn was split into two questions, and additional measures were added.

The Classroom Climate Scale was developed by Hahn et al. (1988), drawing on earlier work exploring the relationship of climate to political attitudes (Ehman, 1970; 1972; Grossman, 1974; Torney, et al., 1975). The alpha reported by Hahn et al. was .51. For this study, one item was dropped from the Hahn scale, and additional questions, designed to explore the range of activities engaged in in classrooms, were added.

Political participation index. The Political Participation Index was developed based on previous work by many researchers (Ehman & Gillespie, 1975; Hess & Torney, 1967; Jones, 1980; Matthews & Prothro, 1966; Stentz, 1974; Woodward & Roper, 1950). The 45 items in this section of the questionnaire were designed to probe the students' personal participation, including frequency of media use, political discussion, and actual participation in political activities within and outside of their school settings. In addition, measures of familial participation and interest, frequencies of activities in social studies classroom, and expected future political participation were included.

Demographic indicators. Part Three of the questionnaire asked students to provide information about their grades, employment, age, race, the social studies classes they had taken, and their parents. Information from this section of the questionnaire was used to provide a demographic portrait of experimental and comparison students, and to explore post hoc development of a model of political interest and participation. Appendix A contains the items from the political attitude scales; Appendix B contains a copy of the entire Political Attitude Questionnaire.

Posttest questionnaire. The posttest questionnaire was a slightly abbreviated version of the pretest questionnaire. The 67 items used to measure political attitudes were reproduced verbatim from the pretest, but the order of the questions was reformatted. The posttest

questionnaire dropped the items from the Participation Index which referred to familial participation, social studies classes, and demographics.

## Analyses

Responses on the pretest and posttest political attitude and behavior measures were analyzed on three levels: 1) the reliability and validity of the instrumentation were assessed; 2) the pretest measures were compared to determine if significant differences existed between the groups prior to the experimental treatment; and 3) a comparison of the changes in group means on attitude and behavior variables was made. All statistical computations were conducted using the SYSTAT program for microcomputers (Wilkenson, 1988).

Instrument analyses. Three primary forms of analysis were conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the political attitude scales. Factor analysis, item analysis, and intercorrelations of scales were used to assess the strength of the instrumentation.

Factor analysis is a statistical technique used to determine the degree to which individual items cluster together to form recognizable constructs. A varimax rotated factor analysis was used to analyze the degree to which items on the Political Attitudes Questionnaire loaded on the discretely designed scales. This procedure was used to test the a priori hypothesis that variables would form the scales as defined, and may, therefore, be considered to be *confirmatory* factor analysis (Kim & Mueller, 1978). The varimax rotated factor analysis serves to define underlying constructs indicated by the data, and provides an indication of the percent variance of each individual variable attributable to each construct.

Item analysis was conducted to determine the reliability of each scale. This procedure provides a Cronbach Alpha for each subtest within an instrument. Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of the internal consistency for sets of questions, which estimates the proportion of the test variance due to common factors among all the items tested. It is therefore a report of how much the subscale score depends on general or group, rather than specific factors (Cronbach, 1951). The value of alpha is equal to the mean of all possible split-half coefficients of the items comprising a scale. For purposes of determining the reliability of the six attitudinal scales, all attitude variables were included in the statistical procedure, each with its a priori defined scale.

Based on the results of these tests, all items were retained for subsequent statistical analyses. The 67 attitude variables were summed and averaged to create six scaled variable values for each study participant. In addition, four behavior variables were created from the summed and averaged items reflecting participation totals for media use, discussions, personal participation, and anticipated future participation. The interrelationships between the scaled political attitude measures were probed through the computation of a Pearson correlation matrix.

Pretest group comparisons. Analyses were conducted on attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic data which compared the experimental and comparison groups on the pretest measures. These analyses were conducted to ascertain if the groups differed significantly on any of the variables measured. To compare pretest measures of attitude and behavior variables, two-way (group by sex) least squares analyses of variance were employed. Tests for interaction effects between sex and group were also made. Least squares ANOVAs were used due to the uneven number of cases in each cell (Wilkenson, p. 506). Since analysis of variance is sensitive to violations of normality of distribution, the data set was checked for outliers as each analysis was conducted. Identified outliers were removed until the data sets were well-conditioned. Comparisons of ordinal level variables were made using chi-square tests of difference.

Analysis of change. To determine if there were significant differences between groups due to the treatment effect of attending the Close Up program, analyses of covariance were conducted, with the pretest measure, group, and sex as covariates, and the posttest mean as the dependent variable. Analysis of covariance allows for statistical control of the pretest differences between groups, in order to provide a clearer picture of the differences attributable to treatment.

Analysis of covariance is recognized to be one of the most precise measures of inferred treatment effects when the correlation of pretest and posttest measures are .60 or above (Linn &

Slinde, 1977), as was true in almost all cases of the scaled attitude and behavioral variables in this experiment. The use of the pretest score as a covariate is important; it allows for statistical control of the differences which existed between the groups prior to the treatment (Pedhazur, 1982; Wildt & Ahtola, 1978). The introduction of sex as a second covariate was employed to avoid any specification errors which might have occurred, given the gender skew of the experimental group. Because of the uneven gender distribution between the two groups, there was the possibility that some effect which was actually attributable to gender differences might be misinterpreted as a treatment effect (Weisburg, 1979). Therefore, pretest scores and gender were controlled as possible confounding factors in the measure of change.

The strongest assumption for the use of ANCOVA procedures is the homogeneity of regression, or homogeneity of slopes of the groups under comparison (Linn & Slinde, 1977). A test of the homogeneity of slopes was performed prior to each ANCOVA to validate that the data met this assumption. No violations were detected. Additionally, since ANCOVAs combine analysis of variance with multiple regression, and each of these procedures is sensitive to statistical outliers, the data set was conditioned to remove outlying cases as the ANCOVAs were conducted.

**Assumptions and Limitations of the Study**

It was assumed by the researcher that: students answered the questionnaire honestly; students reported their true feelings and beliefs about the questions asked; and that students were not influenced by the design of the study. Due to the sampling technique, the generalizability of the results of this study is limited to the population of students who attend Close Up from the state of Georgia. They were but a small proportion of students from across the United States who attended the program in 1989 (a number approximated at 28,000).

The timeline of the study (from January to May of 1989) provided a mere snapshot of students' political attitudes. The effects over time of participation in Close Up are not measured. Further, the timing of the pretest administration corresponded with the inauguration of a new Presidential administration -- an event which focused the attention of the nation on the city of Washington and politics in general. The effects of these events may have possibly inflated the initial measures of political interest or behavior. There is a consequent risk of an inflated decrease in interest in the second round of measurement, as the focus of the news was shifted slightly away from Washington. The fact that both experimental and comparison students experienced these phenomena minimized the influence of these uncontrollable variables.

Another limitation may have been inherent in the population for study. Participation in the Close Up program is a self-selected process. It is possible that the significant differences in attitudinal and behavior measures (as well as demographic measures) between Close Up students and their peers would influence the generalizability of applying any change brought about by their experiences to other members of their peer groups. Close Up students might be more responsive to such an experience, given their predilection to be interested in politics. For that reason, the careful comparison of pretest measures of each group is particularly important.

In spite of these limitations, this study makes a useful contribution to the study of experiential civics education programs. The evaluation of effects of Close Up participation on this sample provides insight into the experiences and thoughts of high school students from a southeastern metropolitan area.

## Findings

The analysis of this data set indicates that for students in the sample, the Close Up experience increased positive feelings toward government and stimulated political participation. The results also show improved reliabilities for the constructs used to measure political attitudes.

### Instrument Analysis

The confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the attitudinal variables loaded on six relatively independent scales as defined a priori. Five of the six scales contained eight or more items for which the underlying dimension accounted for over 50% of the variance; the Political Trust component explained over 50% of the variance for six of its projected items. The Women's Participation and Political Interest were the strongest scales indicated by this analysis: the Women's Participation dimension accounted for at least 65% of the variance in all ten of its projected items, and the Political Interest dimension accounted for at least 60% of the variance for nine of ten of its projected items. Table 1 presents the results of the varimax rotated factor analysis.

---

Insert Table One about Here

---

The item analysis showed that the reliabilities of the attitude scales used in the Political Attitudes Questionnaire were high. Five of the six scales attained reliability coefficients greater than .77, which indicate improvements over those previously reported in the literature. Of particular note are the improvements in the stability of the Classroom Climate ($a$=.782) and Political Efficacy ($a$=.775) measures. The Cronbach Alpha for each scale is presented in Table 1.

Finally, the six scaled attitude variables were compared in a Pearson correlation matrix, presented in Table 2. Three inter-scale correlations (Political Confidence with Political Interest and Political Efficacy; and Political Trust with Political Efficacy) reflect relationships which exceed r=.35 in strength, which raises questions about the discreteness of these scales. The strength of these relationships is partially explained by an examination of the factor analysis, which shows that while most items on these three scales showed primary loadings with their predicted scales, many secondary loadings overlapped among them. The intercorrelations of these factor-based scales, however, do not correctly reflect the underlying correlations of these factors: factor scales will be correlated among themselves even if the underlying factors are assumed to be orthogonal (Kim & Mueller, 1976). Because all of these constructs were designed to measure elements of a single broad category--political attitudes--it is logical that they would, to some extent, be interrelated. The results of the primary components analysis and scale reliability results suggest that it is appropriate to consider the six identified constructs as relatively discrete for the purpose of further statistical analyses.

---

Insert Table Two about Here

---

### Pretest Comparisons

Comparisons of the experimental and comparison groups on pretest measures of demographics, attitudes, and behaviors yielded many interesting insights into the preexisting differences between the two groups. Several statistically significant differences were found in each of these three major categories of variables. All significant differences ascertained from analysis of variance are summarized in Table 3.

Insert Table Three about Here

Demographics. Demographically the two groups differed significantly on measures of both personal and parental characteristics. The students who attended Close Up were predominantly females, and the comparison of gender distribution between the experimental group and their classmates showed the gender skew to be statistically significant ($x^2$=9.699; p=.002). In addition, fewer experimental students reported that they were employed ($x^2$=4.896; p=.027), and those who were employed worked fewer hours than students in the comparison group (F=21.038; p≤.000). A significant interaction effect for sex and group was found for the measure of social studies grades. Pairwise comparisons indicated, however, that only the comparison between control females (M=2.585; SD=1.307) and control males (M=1.778; SD=1.02) was significant (F=5.692; p=.019). No significant differences between groups were discerned on measures of overall grade point average, age, plans to attend college, or ethnic and racial background.

Differences between groups were also found on all three demographic indicators related to students' familial characteristics. The estimated household income level[2] of experimental students was significantly higher than that of their counterparts in the comparison group (F=21.959; p=.000). Furthermore, the levels of educational attainment achieved by fathers and mothers of experimental students was significantly higher than those obtained by parents of the comparison students (F=8.145; p=.005 and F=18.562; p≤.001, respectively).

Attitude variables. The group comparisons of pretest scores on scaled attitude variables also showed some striking differences between the groups. Least squares ANOVAs, using pretest scores as the dependent variable and group and sex as independent variables, indicated that prior to attending Close Up, experimental students scored higher on each of the four traditional measures of political attitudes than did the comparison students. They reported significantly higher feelings of political trust (F=8.721; p=.004), political efficacy (F=5.883; p=.016), political interest (F=35.415; p≤.001) and political confidence (F=19.975; p≤.001). A statistically significant difference was also observed on responses to the Classroom Climate Scale (F=4.190; p=.042), and a main effect for sex, with females indicating more positive attitudes, was found on mean comparisons for women's participation (F=53.952; p≤.001).

Behavior variables. Analysis of differences between groups on scaled political behavior variables indicated that prior to attending Close Up, the experimental students were considerably more involved in political activities than were their classmates who did not choose to go on the program. Significant differences were found for media use (F=19.517; p=.001), frequency of political discussions (F=18.771; p≤.001), personal participation (F=34.027; p≤.001), anticipated future participation (F=17.157; p≤.001), and family participation (F=7.353; p=.007). No statistically significant differences were found on measures of parental interest in politics.

## Analysis of Change

The analyses of covariance produced adjusted means for each group which were controlled for the possible confounding effects of pretest scores and sex. These analyses revealed several important differences between the groups which are attributable to a treatment effect.

As hypothesized, when controlling for pretest differences, students who attended the Close Up program in Washington D. C. had significantly higher mean scores on measures of political confidence (F=9.747, p=.002), political trust (F=7.325; p=.008) and political interest (F=4.237; p=.04) than did students from the comparison group. Contrary to the a priori hypothesis, no significant treatment effects were found for levels of political efficacy at the .05 level. The effect for efficacy approaches significance at the .05 level (F=3.767), and is significant at the .10 level. Analysis of treatment effects for political participation supports the

hypothesis that students in the sample who attended Close Up would become more politically active. Significant treatment effects were observed for both student political participation ($F=32.320$; $p\leq.001$) and for anticipated future participation ($F=17.587$; $p\leq.000$). No significant treatment effects were found for the amount of media consumption or frequency of political discussions. All significant treatment effects are presented in Table 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

## Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

### Instrument Analysis

The results of instrumentation analysis for the Political Attitudes Questionnaire are quite encouraging. Measures of political attitudes have long been plagued by very low reliabilities (Hepburn & Napier, 1980; Stentz & Lambert, 1977), resulting in instruments for which there is little validity or reliability information, and a lack of developed norms for use in future research. Through assessment of face validity and the existing reliability information available from previous scales, reformulations used in this instrument show improvements in operationalizing measures of political attitudes. The insights provided by Stentz and Lambert (1977) were particularly helpful in addressing these issues. Following their analysis of previously used efficacy scales, which indicated that efficacy questions which differentiated between collective and personal references clustered separately when factor analyzed, the efficacy and confidence scales used in this instrument were reformulated. Through the careful distinctions made between feelings of individual and collective influence, each of these scales was strengthened. The addition of several items to both the Women's Participation and Classroom Climate Scales has also improved the reliabilities of these constructs. The Political Trust Scale used in this instrument shows need for improvement. Both the low factor loadings of predicted items on this scale, and the relatively low alpha (.740) indicated that items used for this construct need careful reconsideration. The reliability coefficients for each of the scales was computed using all of the projected scale items; refinements in the strength of the scales could be made by dropping the weaker items for further analysis.

### Pretest Comparisons

The pretest comparisons point out some important preexisting differences between the students who attended Close Up and their classroom peers. The students who chose to participate were already a step ahead of their peers in terms of their political involvement, and they also had more positive political attitudes on the core scales derived from those historically focusing on the democratic civic culture. This finding seems to suggest a potentially causal relationship between positive attitudes and participation which merits further exploration.

It is interesting that the two groups differed significantly on their perceptions of classroom climate. Experimental students perceived the climate to be more positive than did their peers. Because teachers serve as the primary recruiters for Close Up participants, it is likely that they would more strongly encourage students who respond positively to the atmospheres they establish in their classrooms.

The results of these comparisons also provide additional insights into some demographic differences between the groups. The parents of experimental students have a high level of educational attainment: 59% of the mothers and fathers of students in this sample who attended Close Up were college graduates, compared with only 35% of the parents of their classroom peers. Those parents, given their education level, were possibly more likely to place a high value on extracurricular learning experiences such as Close Up, which may influence the likelihood of their childrens' participation. There additionally seems to be an economic factor at work in the selection process. The median estimated household income for experimental students

was $30,700 per year, while the median household income for comparison students was $24,400. The price of student attendance on the Close Up program, which is generally self-funded, may have provided a barrier to participation for some students from the comparison group. These indicated differences between the two groups suggest that a cautious approach to the generalization of other findings is warranted.

These findings are consistent with previous research which strongly establishes the links between educational attainment and socioeconomic status with political attitudes and behaviors. That students in this sample who attended Close Up come from homes with higher incomes and levels of education is probably a reflection of the fact that those parents are more likely to impart higher levels of political interest, efficacy, trust, and involvement (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Hess & Torney, 1967; Milbrath, 1965; and Renshon, 1975).

These findings additionally emphasize the need to introduce statistical controls when making any comparisons of pretest-posttest changes between these groups. They confirm the necessity of using covariance analysis to eliminate the possible confounds of pre-existing differences.

**Analysis of Change**

Overall, the Close Up experience seems to have had a strong impact on the students who attended from Georgia. Traveling to Washington D.C. and interacting with their peers and government officials produced worthwhile results. The increase in their feelings of positive attitudes toward the government is particularly important given the body of literature which suggests that feelings of interest, efficacy, and trust are closely related to political participation. Several political scientists have noted moderate to strong correlations between political attitudes and democratic participation. Political trust is found to correlate strongly with voter turnout and attachment to political structures in society (Abravanel & Busch, 1975), and political efficacy is also strongly related to participation (Campbell, et al., 1952; Olsen, 1972). In examinations of the combined effects of political trust and political efficacy, findings suggest that an integration of high trust and high efficacy produces maximal levels of participation (Fraser, 1975; Hawkins, Marando, & Taylor, 1971). These findings, in conjunction with the observed effects of the Close Up program on this population, suggest that these students will be more likely than their peers to participate in politics in the future.

**Implications of the Research**

An intimidating number of social problems demands the attention of today's social studies educators and secondary school teachers. Rising numbers of teen pregnancies, increasing dropout rates and incidents of violent crime, and the recent resurgence of racism present some of the many challenges to be addressed in our high schools. Encouraging a holistic sense of good citizenship, including tolerance of individual and group differences, respect for others' rights, an understanding of basic social and political systems, and positive political attitudes remain central themes of citizenship education.

Patrick (1969) noted that one of the most important goals for civic education is to increase students' feelings of political interest, efficacy, and trust, as well as to infuse in them a desire for participation in our democratic system. He has suggested that to accomplish this formidable task, pedagogical strategies should be based upon engaging students actively in the quest for knowledge. Many social educators are once again turning toward experiential learning methods as possible avenues for the development of positive attitudes and participatory behavior.

**Recent Trends toward Active Citizenship Education.**

The recent resurgence of experience-based community service curricula suggests that social educators are again exploring the value of involvement-oriented programs for shaping the development of good citizenship in youth. Boyer's (1983) recommendation for the institution of a Carnegie Unit of service is designed to increase active student participation in communities. Boyer maintains that student service would not only increase the sense of community and

common purpose within a school, but would be an effective way of teaching students democratic values.

Gans (1988) also underscores the importance of finding things in the school and the community in which students can be involved. The first step to overcoming the apathy and political non-involvement of youth, he maintains, is to build a sense of efficacy within students, which may be accomplished by increasing their political participation.

Langton (1988) similarly argues that the development of attitudes and norms regarding participation should be the "beginning and endpoint of citizenship education" (p. 12). The essential thrust of citizenship education, he argues, is to assure that citizens understand that they should, can, and will make a difference. Langton identifies openness, integrity, vigorous dialogue and increased opportunities for students to participate in community and school governance as essential components of schooling which would increase student feelings of efficacy.

Results of this study add to a base of research indicating the potentially beneficial results produced by experiential citizenship education. Participation in extracurricular activities such as clubs and student government, becoming involved in the decision-making structure of the school or classroom, or attending special programs such as the Close Up week in Washington have all been shown to have promising effects on secondary students' political orientations. Other research has shown, however, that only a small number of students are actually involved in the types of extracurricular activities which produce these positive results (Boyer, 1983); and that our classrooms (Sirotnik, 1988) and schools (Wood, 1988) are not models of participatory democratic values. Additionally, the cost, structure, and nature of other experiential citizenship programs is such that only a very limited number of students will have the chance to participate in them. While the growth of interest in providing these programs is encouraging, and the results of this research add to indications of the value of experiential programs, more needs to be known about their effects before they are embraced as a panacea for citizenship education.

## Suggestions for Further Research

Because only a limited number of students may have the opportunity to attend the programs such as the one evaluated in this study or others reviewed in the literature, researchers must begin to look beyond particular types of experiences to determine underlying elements of political socialization which may have a more general impact. Past research has indicated that social studies education in our schools is falling short of the goals of providing the proper attitude development for good citizenship; further research is therefore needed to address the specific attributes of socialization which lead to positive attitude and participatory behavior development. Concentration on the following areas of research would substantially improve our knowledge of effective citizenship education:

1. Continued refinement of attitude and behavior measurement. Refinements made in several of the attitude scales used in this research yielded improvements in the validity and reliability of measurements of political attitudes. Using the results of the factor analysis of this data, along with the item reliabilities indicated in the item analysis, it is possible to identify those items which need further refinement. Paying careful attention to the wording of weaker questions, and carefully evaluating their face validity when determining which items to include in further research should additionally strengthen future scales.

2. Increased integration of quantitative and qualitative research designs. Past analysis of experiential programs has focused primarily on the effects of programs, with researchers focusing on comparisons of "what" has happened to students as a result of experiential citizenship education. In order for social education researchers to provide information which would be more applicable to citizenship education in general, we must move beyond the "what" questions, and begin to address the more interesting, if more difficult to answer, questions of "how" and "why". Addressing these complicated questions calls for the inclusion of qualitative

research paradigms. In combination with valid quantitative measures of attitude and behavior development, intensive student interviews and classroom or program observation would be valuable tools in unraveling the intricate impact of various educational techniques, and would provide important data on how schools and classrooms could be structured to provide more effective citizenship education. Qualitative data can be used both to further address the content validity of quantitative measures, and to suggest the formulation of measures for other variables of potential importance.

3. Identification of specific skills for citizenship. Many researchers have postulated that students' involvement in extracurricular activities increases their political participation because it allows them to develop and practice skills they need to participate fully. Others have suggested that critical thinking and smooth interpersonal skills are central elements of participation, but these skills have not been clearly defined. Social educators must work first to define essential skills, then research the appropriate pedagogical methods for their development. The clear definition of these skills will additionally indicate the appropriate research designs and methods which will further our knowledge of effective social studies education.

4. Evaluation of the effects of educational interventions on non-motivated students. Many evaluations of citizenship education programs provide information of limited generalizability. Most of the students who opt to participate in extracurricular activities or other educational programs already have a high level of interest in politics. There remains a paucity of information on the effects these programs would have on students who are initially disinterested in politics. What happens to disinterested students who become involved in the political process? The emergence of required community service for high school graduation in many school districts across the nation should provide a more diversified sample of students through whom this question could be addressed.

5. Studies of effective social studies classrooms. Further inquiries into social studies pedagogy must include the examination of excellent instruction. Research is needed to determine how to structure classrooms for improving political attitudes and encouraging participation in our democratic system. The moderate correlations between classroom climate and other political attitudes found in this study and others indicate potential connections which need to be explored. The impact of controversial issues discussions merits further attention from researchers as a promising method for increasing students interest in the political system.

Social studies educators will continue to face the challenge of generating student interest in politics and encouraging their participation in our democratic system, and how attitudes and participatory behaviors are formulated remains fertile ground for further inquiry by educational researchers. Research focusing on exemplary classrooms will enable us to identify the teaching methods and other classroom variables which will enhance the citizenship education of tomorrow's leaders.

## REFERENCES


Abravanel, M.D., & Busch, R.J. (1975). Political competence, political trust and the action orientations of university students. The Journal of Politics, 37, 57-82.

Agger, R.E., Goldstein, M.N., & Roper, E. (1961). Political activity of American citizens. American Political Science Review, 23, 477-506.

Beck, P.A., & Jennings, M.K. (1982). Pathways to participation. The American Political Science Review, 76, 94-108.

Boyer, E. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. (1960 & 1964). The american voter. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W.E. (1952). The voter decides. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.

Chiarelott, L. (1979). Dewey's theory of experience: An application to citizenship education. The Social Studies, March/April, 81-85.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Pychometrika, 16:3, 297-333.

Coleman, J. S. (1976). Differences between experiential and classroom learning. In Keeton, M. T., (Ed.), (1976) Experiential learning (pp. 49-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Conrad, D. (1979). Experiential education: A summary of its theoretical foundations and a review of the research. Unpublished manuscript.

D'Amico, J. J. (1981). The active approach: A blueprint for citizenship education in the 80s. Clearing House, 54, 185-188.

Ehman, L. H. (1969). An analysis of the relationships of selected educational variables with the political socialization of high school students. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 559-580.

---------- (1970, November). Normative discourse and attitude change in the social studies classroom. The High School Journal, 76-83.

---------- (1972). Political efficacy and the high school social studies curriculum. In B.G. Massialas (ed.) , Political youth, traditional schools: National and multinational perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 90-112.

---------- (1980). The American school in the political socialization process. Review of Educational Research, 50, 99-119.

Ehman, L. H., & Gillespie, J. (1975). The school as a political system. (Final Report) Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (Grant NE-G-00-3-063)

Eyler, J. (1982). Test of a model relating political attitudes to participation in high school activities. Theory and Research in Social Education, 10, 43-62.

Fowlkes, D. L. (1974). The relative effects of the family, the school, peer groups, and the mass media on the political socialization of high school seniors in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Fraser, J. (1970). The mistrustful-efficacious hypothesis and political participation. The Journal of Politics, 32, 444-449.

Gans, C. (1988, Fall). Why young people don't vote. Update on Law Related Education, 72-82.

Grossman, D.L. (1975). Educational climates and attitudes toward dissent: A study of political socialization of conflict norms in adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, California.

Hahn, C.L., & Avery, P. (1985). Value analysis, political attitudes, and reading comprehension. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13, 47-60.

Hahn, C.L., Tocci, C., & Angell, A. (1988). Five nation study of civic attitudes and controversial issues discussions. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Social Studies, Vancouver, B.C. June 23, 1988.

Hanks, M. (1981) Youth voluntary associations and political socialization. Social Forces, 60:1, 211-223.

Harper, N. (1987). The effect of controversial issues discussions on the development of political and economic attitudes in secondary social studies classrooms. Unpublished D.A.S.T. project, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Hawkins, B.W., Marando, U. L., & Taylor, G.A. (1971). Efficacy, mistrust, and political participation: Findings from additional data and indicators. The Journal of Politics, 33, 1130-1136.

Hedin, D., & Conrad, D. (1980, Spring). Study proves hypothesis - and more. Synergist, 8-14.

Hepburn, M.A., & Napier, J. D. (1980). Development and initial validation of an instrument to measure political attitudes. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 1131-1139.

Hertzburg, H. (1982). Social studies reform: 1880-1980. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Hess, R.D., & Torney, J.V. (1967). The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago: Aldine Press.

Holland, A., & Andre, T. (1987). Participation in extracurricular activities in secondary school: What is known, what needs to be known? Review of Educational Research, 57, 437-466.

Houle, C. O. (1976). Deep traditions of experiential learning. In Keeton, M. T., (Ed.), (1976) Experiential learning (pp. 19-33). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Hyman, H. H. (1959). Political socialization. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Jennings, M.K., & Niemi, R. G. (1974). The political character of adolescence. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jones, R. S. (1974). Changing student attitudes: The impact of community participation. Social Science Quarterly, 55, 439-450.

---------- (1975a). Evaluating student involvement as a technique for improving citizenship education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 3, 73-78.

---------- (1975b). Student political involvement and attitude change. Teaching Political Science, 2, 256-274.

----------. (1980) Democratic values and preadult virtues: Tolerance, knowledge and participation. Youth and Society, 12, 189-220.

Keeton, M. T., (Ed.), (1976) Experiential learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Kim, J. O., & Mueller, C.W. (1976). Introduction to factor analysis. Sage university paper series on quantitative applications in the social sciences, 07-013. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

---------- (1978). Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues. Sage university paper series on quantitative applications in the social sciences, 07-013. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

Langton, S. (1988, October). Citizen participation and citizenship education in the 21st century. Paper presented at Citizenship for the 21st Century: A National Conference on the Future of Civics Education. Washington, D.C.

Langton, K. P., & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. American Political Science Review, 62, 852-867.

Linn, R. L., & Slinde, J.S. (1977). The determination of significance of change between pre- and posttesting periods. Review of Educational Research, 47:1, 120-150.

Matthews, D.R., & Prothro, J.W. (1966). Negroes and the new southern politics. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Milbrath, L.W. (1965). Political participation. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Metzger, D.J., & Barr, R.D. (1978). The impact of school political systems on student political attitudes. Theory and Research in Social Education, 6, 48-79.

Newmann, F. M. (1979). Evaluation of the community studies program, 1978-1979. University of Wisconsin.

Olsen, M.E. (1972). Social participation and voting turnout: A multivariate analysis. American Sociological Review, 37, 317-333.

Otto, L. B., & Featherman, D.L. (1975). Social structural and psychological antecedents of self-estrangement and powerlessness. American Sociological Review, 40, 701-719.

Patrick, J.J. (1969). Implications of political socialization research for the role of civic education. Social Education, 33, 15-31.

----------. (1972). The impact of a developmental course, "American Political Behavior," on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of secondary school students. Social Education, 36, 168-179.

Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). Multiple regression analysis in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Renshon, S.A. (1975). The role of personality development in political socialization. In D.C. Schwartz & S.K. Schwartz, (Eds.), New directions in political socialization. New York: Free Press.

Robinson, J. P., Rusk, J. G., & Head, K. B. (1968). Measuring political attitudes. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.

Roselle, P. (1979, Ed.). Revision of the NCSS curriculum guidelines. Social Education, 43:4, 261-274.

Singleton, H.W. (1981). Participatory citizenship education. Theory into Practice, 20, 206-209.

Sirotnik, K.A. (1988). What goes on in classrooms? Is this the way we want it? In Byer, L.E. and Apple, M.W. (Eds.) The curriculum: Problems, politics and possibilities. New York: State University of New York Press

Stentz, M. (1974). Educating for responsible, active citizenship in the "Watergate" Era". Unpublished manuscript.

Stentz, M., & Lambert, (1977). An empirical reformulation of political efficacy. Theory and Research in Social Education, 5, 61-85.

Torney, J.V., Oppenheim, A.N., & Farnen, R.F. (1975). Civic education in ten countries. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Torney-Purta, J. (1988, October). Political socialization. Paper presented at Citizenship for the 21st Century: A National Conference on the Future of Civics Education. Washington, D.C.

Travers, E. F. (1982). Ideology and political participation among high school students. Youth and Society, 13, 327-352.

---------- (1983). The role of school in political socialization reconsidered. Youth and Society, 14, 475-500.

Weisburg, H.I. (1979). Statistical adjustments and uncontrolled studies. Psychological Bulletin, 86:6, 1149-1164.

West, R. (Ed.), (1938). Utilization of community resources in the social studies. Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Cambridge, MA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Wildt, A.R., & Ahtola, O. (1978) Analysis of covariance. Sage university paper series on quantitative applications in the social sciences, 07-012. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

Wilkenson, L. (1988). SYSTAT: The system for statistics. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.

Wood, G.H. (1988). Democracy and the curriculum. In Byer, L.E. and Apple, M.W. (Eds.) The curriculum: Problems, politics and possibilities. New York: State University of New York Press

Woodward, J. L., & Roper, E. (1950) Political activity of American citizens. American Political Science Review, 44, 872-885.

Ziblatt, D. (1970). High school extracurricular activities and political socialization. In Siegal, R.S., (Ed). (1970). Learning about politics. New York: Random House.

## APPENDIX A: POLITICAL ATTITUDE SCALES

Items marked with an asterisk were reversed for analysis, items marked with a # were altered or added after the field test.

Political Confidence Scale (alpha was .802 in field test; .877 in the final analysis)

1. If I joined a political party organization, I would be the kind of member who is able to change people's minds on important issues.
*2. I am not able to influence decisions in groups.
3. I can usually persuade others to agree with my opinions about political issues.
4. I can be effective in political situations (influencing decisions made in school or the
5. Although it is not the most popular thing to do, I can often get my way in groups.
*6. I am not the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections.
7. I sometimes take leadership roles in decision- making situations.
8. I can convince others to support candidates I'm supporting for elections.
9. I can influence how government officials make decisions.
#10. People usually listen to my ideas on political issues.
#11. I can usually contribute some good points during political discussions.
#12. I can often win arguments about politics or social issues.

Political Interest Scale (alpha was .922 in field test; .869 in the final analysis)

1. I would enjoy having lessons where politics and government are discussed.
2. I am usually curious about political matters.
3. I would like to know more about how political parties work.
4. I would like to be on a committee nominating candidates for political office.
*5. I don't think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community.
6. I am interested in following political campaigns.
*7. I don't think I would enjoy participating more in political groups.
8. I think it would be interesting to run for a political office.
9. I think hearing news about political figures and events is interesting.
*10. I don't try to keep up with what is happening in politics.

Political Trust Scale (alpha was .715 in field test; .740 in the final analysis)

1. We can usually trust people who are in government to do what is right for the country.
2. People running the government are honest.
3. People running the government are smart and usually know what they are doing.
4. I think that people in government care about what people like me and my family think.
*5. People in the government who are running the country don't care about the opinions of ordinary people.
#*6. People running the government usually respond to special interests more than they respond to the general public.
7. The government does not waste taxpayers' money.
8. People in government care about what all of us think.
#9. Government officials are too heavily influenced by campaign contributions.
*10. Most public officials do not respond to the needs of the people they represent.

Political Efficacy Scale (alpha for the field test was .692; .775 in the final analysis)

1. People have the opportunity to determine how government is run.
2. Joining interest groups is an effective way people can have a say in how the government runs things.
*3. The way people vote does not affect how things are run in this country.
#*4. Citizens cannot really influence the decisions government officials make.
#5. Citizens can influence decisions made in government by joining a demonstration to protest policies they don't like.
6. What happens in government is influenced by people expressing their opinions on political issues.
#7. A Government policy can be changed if enough people tell government officials they disagree with it.
#*8. If a citizens write letters to their representatives, they can influence the decisions made in government.
9. Making phone calls to express your opinions to officials influences the decisions made in government.
10. Public officials listen to citizens, because if they don't they'll be voted out of office.
#11. People can influence the way government is run by working to get candidates elected.
#12. Citizens just can't compete against big interests, such as corporations, for control over what the government does.
#13. People can influence government by attending community meetings to talk with government officials.

Women's Participation Scale (alpha for field test was .939; .922 in the final analysis)

1. Women should take part in government much the same as men do.
2. Women should have the same opportunities as men to be on the city council.
3. Heads of government like the President should not be men only.
4. Women should run for mayor just like men do.
5. I would be just as likely to vote for a woman as a man for Congress.
*6. Women should not run for public office.
7. Women should run for public office just as often as men do.
8. Women can be as effective as men in politics.
*9. Women cannot be strong political leaders.
*10. Women are not effective in many government positions.

Classroom Climate Scale (alpha for field test was .724; .782 in the final analysis)

1. In our social studies classes, our teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to express them.
2. In social studies classes students are encouraged to make up their own minds about issues.
#*3. Pupils in my social studies class feel uncomfortable expressing their opinions if their teachers disagree with them.
#4. My social studies teachers try to encourage students to express their views on issues.
#*5. In social studies we don't discuss political, economic, and social issues very often.
6. In social studies classes, we have frequently discussed controversial current issues.
7. In social studies class discussions we are encouraged to consider many points of view on issues.
8. We discuss values and value conflicts in our social studies classes.
#9. Our social studies teachers usually present more than one side to an issue when explaining it in class.

10. I feel free to express my opinions in social studies classes, even when I disagree with my teacher.
#11. Our social studies teachers usually don't take one side or the other in political discussions in class.
#12. Students in our social studies class are allowed to express their opinions, no matter how radical they might seem.

## APPENDIX B: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

School Name: _____

Grade Level: _____

Sex: _____

Birthdate: _____
(month/day/year)

**Political Attitudes Questionnaire**

This questionnaire was designed to see how high school students feel about our political system, and to find out about the school activities in which they participate. Please answer the questionnaire honestly. The confidentiality of this questionnaire is ensured. No teachers or other school personnel will see your answers. This is not a test - there are no right or wrong answers. We ask that you work through the questionnaire quickly, and do not spend too much time on any one item.

---

**PART ONE:** *Please use the following scale to indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements. Place the number of your response in the blank to the left of each question.*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| disagree strongly | disagree | disagree slightly | agree slightly | agree | agree strongly |

___1. Joining interest groups is an effective way people can have a say in how the government runs things.
___2. I can convince others to support candidates I'm supporting for elections.
___3. I am not able to influence decisions in groups.
___4. I would enjoy having lessons where politics and government are discussed.
___5. In social studies, we don't discuss political, economic, and social issues very often.
___6. My social studies teachers try to encourage students to express their views on issues.
___7. The government does not waste taxpayers' money.
___8. In our social studies classes, our teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to express them.
___9. I think it would be interesting to run for a political office.
___10. I would like to know more about how political parties work.
___11. Women should not run for public office.
___12. I can usually persuade others to agree with my opinions about political issues.
___13. We can usually trust people who are in government to do what is right for the country.
___14. What happens in government is influenced by people expressing their opinions on political issues.
___15. Citizens can influence decisions made in government by joining a demonstration to protest policies they don't like.
___16. I would like to be on a committee nominating candidates for political office.
___17. Women cannot be strong political leaders.
___18. People running the government are smart and usually know what they are doing.
___19. In social studies class discussions we are encouraged to consider many points of view on issues.
___20. Most public officials do not respond to the needs of the people they represent.
___21. Women should run for public office just as often as men do.
___22. People running the government are honest.
___23. I would be just as likely to vote for a woman as a man for Congress.
___24. Our social studies teachers usually present more than one side to an issue when explaining it in class.
___25. I sometimes take leadership roles in decision-making situations.
___26. I can be effective in political situations (influencing decisions made in school or the community).
___27. We discuss values and value conflicts in our social studies classes.
___28. If citizens write letters to their representatives, they can influence the decision made in government.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| disagree strongly | disagree | disagree slightly | agree slightly | agree | agree strongly |

___29. People in the government who are running the country do not care about the opinions of ordinary people.
___30. If I joined a political party or organization, I would be the kind of member who is able to change people's minds on important issues.
___31. I don't think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community.
___32. People in government care about what all of us think.
___33. A government policy can be changed if enough people tell government officials they disagree with it.
___34. Students in my social studies classes feel uncomfortable expressing their opinions when the teacher disagrees with them.
___35. I don't try to keep up with what is happening in politics.
___36. People running the government usually respond to special interest groups more frequently than they respond to the general public.
___37. Women can be as effective as men in politics.
___38. Government officials are too heavily influenced by campaign contributions.
___39. I think that people in government care about what people like me and my family think.
___40. Women should have the same opportunities as men to be on the city council.

___41. People have the opportunity to determine how government is run.
___42. Citizens cannot really influence the decisions government officials make.
___43. Women should run for mayor just like men do.
___44. Heads of government like the President should not be men only.
___45. I can influence how government officials make decisions.
___46. In social studies courses, we have frequently discussed controversial current issues.
___47. Public officials listen to citizens, because if they don't they will be voted out of office.
___48. The way people vote does not affect how things are run in this country.
___49. I am not the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections.
___50. I am interested in following political campaigns.

___51. Women should take part in government much the same as men do.
___52. Although it is not the most popular thing to do, I can often get my way in groups.
___53. Women would not be effective in many government positions.
___54. People usually listen to my ideas on political issues.
___55. I feel free to express my opinions in social studies, even when I disagree with my teacher.
___56. I am usually curious about political matters.
___57. In social studies classes students are encouraged to make up their own minds about issues.
___58. Making phone calls to express your opinions to officials influences the decisions made in government.
___59. I don't think I would enjoy participating more in political groups.
___60. I think hearing news about political figures and events is interesting.

___61. I can usually contribute some good points during political discussions.
___62. People can influence the way government is run by working to get candidates they like elected.
___63. Our social studies teachers usually don't take one side or the other in political discussions in class.
___64. People can influence government by attending community meetings to talk with government officials.
___65. I can often win arguments about politics or social issues.
___66. Students in our social studies class are allowed to express their opinions, no matter how radical they might seem.
___67. Citizens just can't compete against big interests, such as corporations, for control over what the government does.

---

**PART TWO:** *The following section asks several questions about different activities in which you might participate. Please use the scale indicated above each set of questions, and write the number of your response in the blank provided to the left of each question.*

A. Your Personal Political Participation

Please use the following scale when answering questions 1- 4. Place a number in each of the blanks provided.

(1) Never (2) 3-4 times/month (3) 2-3 times/week (4) almost daily

1. About how often do you use the following types of news media to gain information about public affairs and current events?

___a. Newspaper

___b. Television

___c. Radio

___d. News Magazines ( *e.g. Time, Newsweek, U.S. News)*

___2. How frequently do you discuss current affairs and politics with your parents?

___3. How frequently do you discuss current affairs and politics with your peers?

___4. How frequently do you discuss current affairs and politics with your teachers?

---

Use the following scale for questions 5-10:

(1) no (2) once (3) 2-3 times (4) more than 3 times

___5. Have you ever helped a candidate for office by wearing a button, passing out flyers, attending rallies, or making phone calls for a campaign?

___6. Have you ever been an officer of a school club or elected to any leadership positions?

___7. Have you ever been a member of student government at school?

___8. Have you ever communicated with a public official or political leader to ask for information or express your opinion on any issue?

___9. Have you ever attended any meetings where political speeches were made?

___10. Have you ever visited your state capitol to watch your state legislature?

---

Please use the following scale for questions 11-13:

(1) none (2) 1-2 (3) 3-4 (4) more than 4

___11. Do you participate in activities outside of the school? (such as church activities, 4H, Scouts, or other civic organizations)

___12. Are you a member of any special interest groups? (such as Students Against Drunk Driving, National Rifle Association, Greenpeace, Amnesty International, etc.)

___13. How many school clubs or organizations (excluding sports) have you participated in?

---

___14. Did you watch any of the presidential or vice presidential debates earlier this year?
(1) no (2) 1-2 hours (3) 3-4 hours (4) more than 4 hours

___15. Did you watch or listen to either the Republican or Democratic Presidential Nominating Conventions last summer?
(1) no (2) 1-2 hours (3) 3-5 hours (4) more than 5 hours

---

B. Your Expected Future Participation

How likely do you think it will be that you will:

(1) I don't think I will (2) I might (3) I probably will (4) I definitely will

___1. Run for public office?

___2. Vote in a general election?

___3. Vote in local elections?

___4. Work for a political candidate?

___5. Join a political organization? (such as Young Democrats, Young Republicans)

___6. Join a special interest group? (such as the National Rifle Association, Nuclear Freeze Movement, Right to Life, Sierra Club)

___7. Express your opinion on an issue to a government official?

___8. Write a letter to the editor of a newspaper or magazine expressing a political opinion?

C. Your Family's Political Participation

Please use the following scale for questions 1-6
(1) no (2) 1-2 times (3) 3-4 times (4) 5 or more times (5) don't know

___1. Has your family ever had a political bumper sticker on an automobile?
___2. Has your family ever displayed a lawn sign for a political candidate?
___3. Have your parents ever volunteered or worked for a political cause?
___4. Have your parents ever contributed money to a political party, interest group, or candidate?
___5. Have either of your parents ever been elected or appointed to a government position?
___6. Have either of your parents ever volunteered their time or services to a community organization?

___7. How interested is your father or male guardian in political matters?
1) not interested 2) slightly interested 3) very interested

___8. How much interest does your mother or female guardian take in political matters?
1) not interested 2) slightly interested 3) very interested

___9. Did your father or male guardian vote in the 1988 presidential election?
1) yes 2) no 3) don't know

___10. Did your mother or female guardian vote in the 1988 presidential election?
1) yes 2) no 3) don't know

D. Your Social Studies Classes

(1) never (2) one time/year (3) two times/year (4) more than two times/year

___1. How often do your social studies classes have the opportunity to talk with leaders of the community or officials of state or local government?

___2. How often do your social studies classes do activities to help you understand how government works?

___3. How often do you have debates on issues in your social studies classes?

___4. How often do your social studies classes take field trips into the community?

E. How much do you think the following levels of government affect your everyday life?

(1) not at all (2) not very much (3) a little bit (4) a lot

___1. City and county government

___2. State government

___3. Federal government in Washington

**PART THREE:** *This section is designed to help us learn more about you. Answering these questions is optional, but your responses will provide valuable statistical information. Please write the number of the appropriate response in the blank provided before each number.*

___1. Which range reflects your current grade point average in school?
(1) A (2) A-B (3) B-C (4) C-D (5) D and below

___2. What kind of grades do you usually get in social studies classes?
(1) A's (2) A's and B's (3) B's (4) B's and C's (5) C's (6) C's and D's (7) D's and lower

___3. Are you currently employed?
(1) yes (2) no

___4. If employed, about how many hours a week do you work?
(1) 1-5 (2) 5-10 (3) 11-15 (4) 16-20 (5) more than 20

___5. Do you plan to go to college?
(1) yes (2) no

___6. What is your current age?
(Please write the age in the blank)

___7. What is your race or ethnic background?
(1) American Indian (2) Asian (3) Hispanic (4) Black (5) Caucasian

8. Which of the following social studies classes have you taken in high school? Please check all classes which apply:

___American History ___World History ___Economics

___American Government ___Civics ___Geography

Others:_____.

9. What is your mother or female guardian's current occupation? _____

10. What is your father or male guardian's current occupation? _____

_____11. What was the highest grade attained by your mother or female guardian?
(1) elementary school (2) less than high school (3) high school graduate (4) some college
(5) college graduate (6) graduate school

_____12. What was the highest grade attained by your father or male guardian?
(1) elementary school (2) less than high school (3) high school graduate (4) some college
(5) college graduate (6) graduate school

## ENDNOTES

1. Each school from the 1989 Georgia Close Up population of schools was rated as "urban" "suburban" or "rural" based on a combination of the population density and the urban percentage rating listed for the county in which it is located. Population statistics and urban ratings were taken from the 1985 Statistical Abstract of the United States County and City Data Book. (U.S. Bureau of Census. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office).

2. The family income of each student was estimated based on their responses to questions about their parents' occupations. A chart from the U.S. Department of Labor, which lists median weekly earnings of full-time workers by detailed occupation and sex was used. These statistics represent national averages, which may have resulted in either inflated or deflated estimates of actual job earnings in the state of Georgia, depending on the occupations listed. No attempts to adjust for level of education or years of job experience were made. The statistics used to make the estimates were found in Labor Force Statistics Derived from Current Population Survey, 1948-1987. (U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. August, 1988. Bulletin 2307. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Table 1

Results of Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis on the Political Attitude Questionnaire

| Scale Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PI 1 | **.730** | -.037 | .056 | .113 | .201 | .101 |
| PI 2 | **.729** | -.041 | .110 | .214 | .178 | .163 |
| PI 7 | **.669** | .117 | .110 | .214 | .178 | .104 |
| PI 9 | **.654** | .034 | .154 | .057 | -.027 | .088 |
| PI 8 | **.654** | .000 | .017 | -.044 | .143 | -.024 |
| PI 1 | **.653** | -.040 | .166 | -.046 | .166 | .203 |
| PI 4 | **.617** | -.044 | -.039 | .073 | .110 | -.034 |
| PI 10 | **.600** | .079 | .025 | .190 | .222 | .211 |
| PI 3 | **.569** | .128 | -.037 | .057 | .070 | .301 |
| CC10 | .501 | .094 | .239 | .192 | -.052 | .021 |
| WP8 | -.002 | **.896** | .068 | .145 | .023 | -.117 |
| WP4 | .165 | **.864** | .070 | .038 | -.035 | -.023 |
| WP9 | -.023 | **.815** | -.001 | .046 | .055 | -.038 |
| WP1 | -.117 | **.808** | -.018 | .009 | .071 | -.072 |
| WP2 | .109 | **.783** | .101 | .129 | .080 | -.026 |
| WP5 | .004 | **.780** | -.042 | .191 | -.021 | -.014 |
| WP10 | .019 | **.771** | .067 | -.007 | .064 | -159 |
| WP7 | -.031 | **.769** | .006 | .031 | -.011 | 120 |
| WP6 | .012 | **.682** | -.148 | .082 | .060 | .160 |
| WP3 | .120 | **.649** | .108 | -.036 | -.145 | -.031 |
| PE13 | .144 | .003 | **.723** | .102 | -.042 | -.101 |
| PE9 | .060 | .019 | **.709** | .194 | -.013 | 129 |
| PE7 | .093 | -.066 | **.701** | .059 | .152 | .113 |
| PE8 | .138 | .086 | **.639** | .173 | .067 | .164 |
| PE4 | -.018 | .049 | **.606** | .147 | .129 | .303 |
| PE1 | .097 | -.071 | **.573** | .090 | .127 | .166 |
| PC9 | .097 | .031 | **.565** | .054 | .200 | .247 |
| PE5 | -.026 | .101 | **.519** | -.135 | -.090 | -.029 |

| Scale Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CC7 | .167 | .032 | .079 | **.766** | .072 | .123 |
| CC1 | .092 | .031 | .064 | **.721** | -.047 | -.094 |
| CC4 | .121 | .043 | .050 | **.630** | -.023 | -.032 |
| CC9 | -.026 | .137 | -.103 | **.622** | .157 | .173 |
| CC6 | .217 | .034 | .068 | **.619** | .173 | .071 |
| CC2 | .048 | .128 | .174 | **.598** | .036 | -.127 |
| CC12 | .174 | .087 | .271 | **.553** | -.025 | -.001 |
| CC8 | .177 | .047 | .149 | **.516** | .211 | .310 |
| CC5 | -.081 | .005 | .147 | **.515** | .226 | .028 |
| PC3 | .027 | -.094 | -.039 | .021 | **.724** | .089 |
| PC6 | .138 | .059 | .064 | .052 | **.705** | -.123 |
| PC8 | .083 | .009 | -.017 | .015 | **.679** | 3094 |
| PC2 | -.043 | .064 | .241 | .043 | **.668** | .055 |
| PC4 | .378 | .063 | .083 | .102 | **.614** | .150 |
| PC5 | .190 | -.001 | -.024 | -.020 | **.588** | -.139 |
| PC1 | .341 | .057 | .142 | .009 | **.566** | -.155 |
| PC10 | .491 | .124 | .081 | .186 | **.511** | .085 |
| PT2 | .198 | .111 | .095 | .099 | -.012 | **.645** |
| PT4 | .086 | .044 | .329 | .068 | .100 | **.618** |
| PT3 | -.044 | -.061 | .237 | .098 | -.058 | **.588** |
| PT10 | .237 | -.111 | .013 | .128 | -.048 | **.586** |
| PT5 | .020 | .063 | .301 | .240 | .203 | **.561** |
| PT9 | .168 | -.029 | -.045 | -.075 | .012 | **.509** |
| PT8 | .092 | .056 | .328 | .298 | .103 | **.464** |
| PT9 | .045 | -.101 | -.033 | -.073 | -.106 | **.426** |
| | | | | | | |
| PE12 | -.083 | .085 | .241 | -.002 | .198 | .357 |
| PT7 | .107 | -.041 | -.016 | .023 | -.092 | .334 |
| PT6 | -.012 | -.098 | .058 | -.114 | .221 | .299 |
| PE6 | .038 | .136 | .243 | .001 | .180 | .271 |
| PI5 | .334 | .175 | -.003 | .174 | .412 | .125 |
| PE11 | .201 | .134 | .400 | .124 | .069 | .119 |

| Scale Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CC11 | .028 | .035 | -.019 | .260 | -.058 | .107 |
| PC11 | .456 | .075 | .145 | .197 | .445 | .078 |
| PC7 | .414 | -.078 | .139 | .117 | .492 | .077 |
| PE2 | .078 | .191 | .193 | -.153 | .007 | .057 |
| PE10 | .009 | -.124 | .369 | .228 | .180 | -.053 |
| CC3 | .033 | -.028 | .161 | .237 | -.185 | -.050 |
| PE3 | .025 | -.055 | .197 | .012 | .236 | -.025 |
| PC12 | .497 | -.048 | .225 | .107 | .478 | -.007 |

CRONBACH's ALPHA FOR EACH SCALE (using all predicted items in analysis):

| Political Interest | Women's Participat'n | Political Efficacy | Classroom Climate | Political Confidence | Political Trust |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .869 | .922 | .775 | .782 | .877 | .740 |

Table 2

Pearson Correlation Matrix of the Six Scaled Political Attitude Variables

| | Political Confidence | Political Interest | Political Trust | Political Efficacy | Women's Participat'n | Classroom Climate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PC | 1.000 | | | | | |
| PI | .607 | 1.000 | | | | |
| PT | .257 | .322 | 1.000 | | | |
| PE | .384 | .306 | .412 | 1.000 | | |
| WP | .066 | .071 | -.013 | .106 | 1.000 | |
| CC | .314 | .347 | .253 | .334 | .172 | 1.000 |

Table 3: Group Differences on Pretest Measures of Political Attitudes, Behaviors, and Demographics

| | | GROUP | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | EXP | CON | | |
| Variable | N | X±SD | X±SD | F | p |
| Political Confidence | 163 | 4.249<br>.631 | 3.823<br>.826 | 19.975 | ≤ .001 |
| Political Interest | 153 | 4.734<br>.660 | 3.972<br>.922 | 35.415 | ≤ .001 |
| Political Trust | 160 | 3.328<br>.545 | 3.017<br>.626 | 8.721 | .004 |
| Political Efficacy | 166 | 4.284<br>.560 | 4.095<br>.611 | 5.883 | .016 |
| Classroom Climate | 165 | 4.704<br>.756 | 4.623<br>.634 | 4.190 | .042 |
| Media Use | 157 | 3.121<br>.384 | 2.790<br>.571 | 19.517 | ≤ .001 |
| Political Discussion | 164 | 2.816<br>.643 | 2.345<br>.704 | 18.771 | ≤ .001 |
| Political Participation | 167 | 2.138<br>.430 | 1.765<br>.458 | 34.027 | ≤ .001 |
| Future Participation | 164 | 2.536<br>.454 | 2.231<br>.533 | 17.157 | ≤ .001 |
| Family Participation | 162 | 1.651<br>.639 | 1.434<br>.492 | 7.353 | .007 |
| Students' Employment Hours | 88 | 2.880<br>1.453 | 3.939<br>1.122 | 21.038 | ≤ .001 |
| Mothers' Education | 160 | 4.448<br>1.127 | 3.764<br>1.133 | 18.536 | ≤ .001 |
| Fathers' Education | 162 | 4.509<br>1.311 | 3.807<br>1.337 | 8.145 | .005 |
| Family Income | 154 | 4.019<br>1.189 | 3.243<br>1.222 | 21.959 | ≤ .001 |

Table 4

Results of Attitude and Behavior Analyses of Covariance with Pretest, Group, and Sex as Covariates and Posttest Scores as Dependent Variables

| | | Pretest Means | | Posttest Means | | Adjusted Means | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VARIABLE | N | EXP | CON | EXP | CON | EXP | CON | F | p |
| PC | 160 | 4.249 | 3.823 | 4.320 | 3.764 | 4.125 | 3.895 | 9.747 | .002 |
| PI | 163 | 4.743 | 3.823 | 4.638 | 3.804 | 4.305 | 4.098 | 4.237 | .041 |
| PT | 163 | 3.328 | 3.017 | 3.519 | 3.178 | 3.451 | 3.254 | 7.35 | .008 |
| PE | 157 | 4.283 | 4.095 | 4.402 | 4.069 | 4.294 | 4.165 | 3.77 | .054 |
| PAR | 160 | 2.134 | 1.765 | 2.321 | 1.818 | 2.110 | 1.874 | 32.320 | ≤ .001 |
| FPAR | 160 | 2.563 | 2.231 | 2.686 | 2.283 | 2.549 | 2.346 | 17.587 | ≤ .001 |